

Appendix A

In June last year we submitted plans for a modest, single storey, environmentally-friendly 2-bedroom annex in the grounds of our home for my wife's elderly parents. The building, replacing our stable block, was designed to resemble a small low farm building in original Cotswold stone.

Our architect, with 25 years experience in the Cotswolds had adhered to the Cotswold vernacular and numerous similarly-designed local buildings.

In August last year, at the request of our planning officer SARAH DE LA COZE, we withdrew our application due to concerns from the Tree Officer, Conservation Officer and Parish Council. We addressed EACH and EVERY ONE of their points, mainly by making the building LOWER, SMALLER and MOVING IT AWAY from the road and village green boundaries, and sought Sarah's informal approval. After several weeks of waiting, we learned she had left on maternity leave.

You may not have seen either of these proposals, as for some reason they were given different numbers.

4 months later we were finally granted a pre-app meeting with JANE FRAY, the temporary planning officer, who effectively reassessed the application from scratch. At the meeting, she made recommendations about positioning, which our architect sketched out and agreed in her presence.

We resubmitted and I personally presented these plans to The Parish Council in May. There were no objections from them, OR from any member of the public during the public consultation period.

Our THIRD planning officer, JOANNA LISHMANN, then advised us that the Conservation Officer, Mr Martin, WHO HAD BEEN CONSULTED ON BOTH PREVIOUS SCHEMES, now had new concerns about the possible impact of the building when viewed from the road on entering the village. His alternative suggestion was an arbitrary red shape drawn in the middle of our garden ! Without even a visit.

We requested a site meeting thinking that when he actually SAW the view from the road his concern would be dispelled.

ON 6 June 2019 our site visit was finally granted but Mr Martin refused to be moved or discuss a compromise. Ms Lishman was apologetic about the changing advice but deferred to Mr Martin and advised us to apply to you.

We strongly maintain that there will actually be a REDUCTION in visible impact following the removal of our stables and have provided you with photographs to support our case.

We have done our best, for more than a year, to work with the planning department. For every good-faith submission, we have received different and conflicting comments from 3 planning officers who have ever-changing requirements and who ignore previously given advice.

To round things off we learned last week that our THIRD planning officer has now departed too!!

We thank our ward member for his support in allowing us to bring our reduced annex proposal to this committee. Now that we have addressed the concerns of the parish, and those of 2 previous planning officers, we ask for your final approval.

**NICK SNELL'S STATEMENT FOR THE PLANNING
COMMITTEE 02/09/19**

**RE: 19/00927/HHD-Pinsley Farmhouse, Long
Hanborough**

Dear Members of the Planning Committee

Thank you for giving me the time and opportunity to allow me to present my case for the much-needed extension to my home.

I hope you didn't mind me forwarding photos to you prior to this meeting. I am aware your time is valuable so hope the photographs avoid the need to visit site. They also show that my proposed building work would have a very limited impact on my immediate neighbours. My local Councillor, Merilyn Davies, on making a site visit, was happy to support my planning application and call it in to committee.

Both my neighbours, Steve Pottinger and Colin James, are fully supportive of the application and as such have written letters of support. Both Mr Pottinger and Mr James, a former Chairman of West Oxfordshire District Council, are very happy with the proposed design and in particular with the positioning of the front extension.

My property is currently a very inefficient building and the changes I propose would reduce energy consumption and enhance the environmental benefits.

You may be aware that my property benefits from Permitted development rights and therefore allows me to extend the property considerably to the rear both single and two storey.

I find it strange that I can alter that property's appearance and therefore it's "character" at the rear but not at the front. The initial concerns of the Planning Officer regarding the property's character, I would argue, are entirely subjective and I would ask that the Planning Committee reconsider.

The design features I have proposed would mirror the new developments in the local area and therefore conform to design principles that WODC have approved recently.

I would like to bring to the Committee's attention to a number of properties that have been recently altered and extended dramatically in this area. These extensions have had an impact on the size, bulk and scale of the existing dwellings which are in far more prominent positions and street scenes. This highlights inconsistencies within the Planning department in determining these types of extension applications.

The examples are as follows:

1. 162 Wroslyn Road, Freeland, OX29 8AQ
2. The Old Police House, Witney Road, Long Hanborough, OX29 8HE (Which I note this committee passed)
3. Whittons, Park Road, Combe, OX29 8NA
4. Chain End, 39 Bladon Road, Woodstock, OX20 1QD
5. 145 Main Road, Long Hanborough, OX29 8JZ

Though my site is clearly large enough for redevelopment, I am not a developer. I bought this house to live in and stay in and would like to be given the opportunity to extend it to a size that the plot deserves so I can enjoy my family home and its surroundings.

On reviewing my statement, photographs and strong neighbour support, I hope you will see that the renovations and extensions to my property would only enhance it and I respectfully request you grant me planning permission.

Thank you all.

Nick Snell

Eleftheria, Hastings Hill, Churchill

We bought Eleftheria to be our forever family home in 2018. We are both local, with my partner having grown up in an estate workers cottages in Sarsden and Chadlington, and myself in Bourton on the water.

Eleftheria is a very tired, modest 2 bedroom property and when we bought it we recognised that in its current state it was unsuitable for modern living.

It does however have generous amenity space, unlimited parking via its side access, and a 250ft garden, with the total plot extending to almost 1/3 acre.

Our primary aim for extending is to create a family home suitable for our all of our foreseeable needs, whilst limiting the impact on the village and building something that improves and compliments the existing building. We believe that this is what we have designed.

The planning officer offered very little feedback to our initial proposal other than that she felt the extension was incongruous to the existing building and also mentioned over development.

In an attempt to try to find a compromise we reduced the width, depth and ridge height of the extension, but still the feedback was the same, very short, with no offer of a compromise. We then submitted the 3D visuals to aid visualisation of the extension and demonstrate how much thought has gone into the design.

The planning officer then rather abruptly left the council before the process was complete.

You will see from the 3D visuals that the proposal is extremely sympathetic and in keeping with the existing building and is also barely visible from the road. The extension is positioned on the northern elevation of the property, reducing impact on neighbours to an absolute minimum, it extends rearward just 2 meters further than the existing pitched roof lean-to that we plan to demolish.

During the process we referenced a very similar extension on nearby Sidings Road as a precedent, it is visible from our upstairs windows and was passed in 2014 on near identical property to ours. That extension is in fact considerably

larger and less subtly positioned to our proposal, but with extremely similar roof lines and elevations.

The planning officer, when pressed, stated that she would support a re-application where the extension was positioned to the side of the property, extending right across to the boundary on the left.

It is our view, and that of the villagers I have discussed it with that this would be highly damaging to the village. It would set a precedent for next door to extend in the same way and would lead to the creation of a terracing effect on Hastings Hill, this would clearly be incongruous to the existing street scene and completely change the character of this historic part of the village.

Importantly it would also remove access to the large rear garden, meaning trailers and other unsightly vehicles would have to be stored to the front of the property, it would reduce of street parking to just 2 small cars, forcing us and visitors to park on the road. Something that the village and parish council have confirmed they are strongly opposed too.

I believe that our proposal would create a family home that is designed with conservation, subtlety and modern living in mind, it would create a balanced dwelling that is more suited to the extent of its generous amenities and would not impact or negatively affect the existing character or visual appeal of Hastings Hill by maintaining open space between the existing properties, reducing on-street parking and maintaining vehicular access and storage to the rear.



Tom Burdett

Appendix D

Burford Car Park, Guildenford.

Burford, population 1,300, 252 listed buildings and a town council precept of £70,000 per annum.

60 shops and business on the High Street.

Recently rebuilt Warwick Hall has a max capacity of 350 persons and a usual 200+ for events.

Both share a 166 space car park built in 1997.

One permission for a temporary permission, 2 years, has expired. I would like a three year renewal.

During the two year temporary permission one year was spent getting plans, costings and other information together for a permanent 177 space extension to the north of the existing car park.

This application was submitted during the second year of the temporary permission but the statutory consultees objected for conflicting reasons so the application was withdrawn.

The site is in Flood Plain 3(b).

OCC state that the roads are unsuitable and that visitors should be encouraged to visit by bicycle. All roads in Burford are medieval and unsuitable. Moreover, the visitors drive in with bicycles on their vehicles and cycle around from Burford. OCC would not accept traffic survey information from the Warwick hall planning application so a new survey must be conducted.

The EA want a flood risk assessment and a topographic survey plus the Controlled Water Risk Assessment which we already have. The millstream through the car park is classified as "main river".

Historic England and WODC Conservation want the area moved from the north to the east so that it 'will not affect the setting of a Grade 1 listed building'. That building cannot be seen from the north of the field during the summer nor can the field be seen from the churchyard due to trees, bushes and other foliage. Historic England and WODC Conservation want the area moved to the east which is in the flood water flow path.

Find another site; Burford goes up 1:4 and down 1:4 both sides of the built environment. The only other site west of the doctor's surgery is described in the SHLAA as suitable for housing, so the landowner has refused it for a car park.

Burford has a second car park at the cadet and scout hut near the A40 but people will not use it because they would have to walk up hill to return to their cars.

I think you can appreciate that three years will be needed to resolve all the issues. The choice, without a car park extension is, support the Warwick hall and church at the loss of the shops. Or close the car aprk to Warwick hall users.

Derek Cotterill

1 September 2019



attwells^{LLP}
Solicitors & Planning Consultants



Application No. 19/02012/FUL - 34 Grove Road, Bladon

Presentation to Committee 2nd September 2019

Good afternoon

My name is Fiona Bradley, I am the Planning & Enforcement Manager at Attwells Solicitors. I represent Mr David Tolley of Diamond Quarry House, Grove Road, Bladon, owner of the property immediately adjoining the application site, who strongly objects to this application.

It became apparent back in April that breaches of planning control were occurring at the site. Initial feedback from Council officers was that enforcement action was likely and that the land would be restored to its previous levels. Over time it was apparent that this would not occur and the Council instead sought a retrospective application which was subsequently submitted.

This application is the third for the redevelopment of this site. The first was withdrawn and, in the Design and Access Statement for the second application, the architect explained the process that produced the approved boundary treatment, which included input from Planning and Conservation officers and Bladon Parish Council.

However, the approved boundary treatment was wholly disregarded and the land levels were altered significantly, including raising the land level along the boundary adjacent to my client's driveway by 1.3 metres and erecting a retaining wall, together with the erection of a second retaining wall on the site.

The site is entirely within the Bladon Conservation Area. By law the Council has a duty to preserve and enhance the special historic interest of conservation areas, this includes the area in its entirety, not just areas visible from the road. It is noted that the Council's Conservation Officer has not commented on the unauthorised works, either during the enforcement investigation or for this retrospective application. Given the 'severity of the case' as described by the case officer, I find this surprising as ask if this is common practise.



attwells^{LLP}
Solicitors & Planning Consultants



The previously approved hedge with post and rail fence would have been more in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area than the hard, over-engineered urban edge which has been created. Even with the proposed hedge on top of the retaining wall the boundary treatment is in sharp contrast to the surrounding conservation area.

In addition, the erection of the retaining wall along my client's driveway has greatly reduced visibility along the driveway, which bends around the site, adversely affecting the safety of driveway users.

This retrospective application contains a number of inaccuracies within the application form itself, the submitted drawings and the statement. In particular, the statement states that the planning permission was granted without a boundary treatment and this is simply not correct.

To conclude, it is considered the application represents a form of development that does not in any way preserve or enhance the special historic interest of the Bladon Conservation Area and therefore it should be refused planning permission and an enforcement notice be issued requiring the land levels to be restored to the previous levels.

Thank you for your time.

Fiona Bradley BRP, MRTPI
Planning & Enforcement Manager
Attwells Solicitors

Appendix F

Thank you for the opportunity to speak in relation to this planning application.

As set out by Planning Officers, planning permission for a replacement dwelling on the site was first granted in September 2018 and while development on the site progressed, works had been carried out to the rear garden that do not form part of the approved plans. Accordingly, West Oxfordshire District Council invited a planning application on the matter, and Edgars are agents of this application.

Planning Officers were pro-active in liaising with us on the changes made at the site, visiting the site several times.

This planning application seeks to regularize the works undertaken, and to update on a number of minor items elsewhere on the site which our client also wishes to update.

The Officer has set out the key changes sought, though I would specifically note:

- The type of the new hedge near the edge of the rear garden has been agreed with Planning Officers – [it would be a Yew hedge (therefore evergreen) planted at a height of 700mm and grown to 5ft, positioned with a set in by 300mm from the retaining wall. It will be an instant type – i.e. grown elsewhere and planted as a continuous boundary, rather waiting for individual plants to form the boundary. The Yew, along with use of ivy on the retaining walls would create a soft appearance, and would safely separate the garden and the private lane.
- In addition, the revised step design to access the rear garden, with the upper platform altered to match the width of the already approved door, and has the same privacy screen as previously approved.

There are several reasons why this planning application should be approved:

- The principle of similar development on this site has already been established through the granting of the previous planning application.
- The amendments proposed in this application are minor in nature, and it has been confirmed by Planning Officers that the changes would not cause harm to the Green Belt, the Conversation Area or to neighbouring amenity.
- The technical consultees are all satisfied. This includes Drainage Officers, Highways Officers, Tree Officers.
- We have worked proactively with the Officers involved to address any queries during the application. They have confirmed the proposal accords with the Development Plan.
- To reassure also - It is noted that the permission would remove Permitted Development rights.

Planning Officers confirmed that the proposal respects the special qualities and historic context of the conservation area.

In summary, this application represents limited change to a previously approved permission. It is in keeping with Bladon, and does not result in harm to the Green Belt. Due consideration has been provided to the neighbouring amenity and to design. We thank Planning Officers for working with us to regularize the amendments, and hope you can support their recommendation for approval.